



3-10-06

AFZ

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In Re: Application of:  
**Dab Door Company, Inc.**

Date: March 9, 2006

Filing Date: September 25, 2003

Serial No. 10/669,900

Attorney Dkt. No. 230199.3

Title: "SURFACE MOUNT WINDOW FOR DOORS"

**EXPRESS MAIL CERTIFICATE**

"Express Mail" Mailing Label No: EV 528555159 US

Date of Deposit: March 9, 2006

I hereby certify that this paper(s) or fee is hereby being deposited with the United States Postal Service's "Express Mail Post Office To Addressee" service pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to the **Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA, 22313-1450**. I have been warned that willful false statements and the like are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both (18 U.S.C. 1001), and may jeopardize the validity of this application, document, registration or patent resulting therefrom.

**Papers included:**

- 1) Brief (Amended) for Appellant; and
- 2) postcard.

Adrian Rojas, Patent Dept.  
235 S.W. Le Jeune Road, Miami, FL 33134

Adrian Rojas  
Signature of person mailing paper(s) or fee



1 THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
2 BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES  
3

4 In Re: Application of: Date: March 7, 2006  
5 Allen Berger, Jr.  
6 Serial No.: 10/669,900 Art Unit: 3635  
7 Filed: September 25, 2003 Examiner: Robert J. Canfield  
8 For: "SURFACE MOUNT WINDOW FOR DOORS"  
9 Atty. Dkt. No. 230199.3

10 \_\_\_\_\_  
11  
12 **BRIEF (AMENDED) FOR APPELLANT**  
13

14 Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences  
15 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
16 P.O. Box 1450  
17 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

18  
19 Honorable Board Members:

20  
21 This is an appeal from the Examiner of Art Unit 3635 finally rejecting  
22 claims 1 and 4 on appeal, and for which an amendment after final rejection  
23 was presented to the Examiner for the purposes of this appeal. The claims  
24 on appeal are included in:

25  
26 **I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST.**  
27

28 The Applicant, Allen Berger, Jr., is the real party in interest.

1           **II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES.**

2

3       There are no other related appeals or interferences.

4

5           **III. STATUS OF CLAIMS.**

6

7       The following claims were filed with the continuation application

8       (with the preliminary amendment) for the Surface Mount Window for

9       Doors:

10

11       1. A window assembly for garage doors, comprising:

12

13       A) a transparent panel having an external surface and an internal

14       surface, said external surface including a peripheral flange member making

15       said external surface larger than said internal surface with respective

16       external and internal peripheral edges, and said peripheral flange member

17       further including a peripheral underside surface that comes in abutting

18       contact against the peripheral external surface adjacent to an opening in a

19       garage panel with cooperative dimensions to permit said internal surface to

20       go through; and

1           B)   means for mounting said transparent panel on said garage  
2   panel.

3

4           4.   The window assembly set forth in claim 1 wherein said means  
5   for mounting said transparent panel on said garage panel includes:

6

7           C)   an external frame assembly mounted on said garage panel  
8   around said external peripheral edge.

9

10          This application is a continuation of application serial No. 10/244,482  
11         filed on September 17, 2002. Initially, Applicant filed a preliminary  
12         amendment leaving two claims in this patent application. Claim 1 is  
13         derived from the parent application and new claim 4. The amendment  
14         filed on April 21, 2005, added the words "coplanarly extending" for  
15         clarification purposes. The amendment after final rejection (permitted by  
16         the examiner) replaced the word "go" with pass and added the words said  
17         opening also for clarification purposes. The two claims are rejected.

18

19

20

21

1           **IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS.**

2

3       The Examiner entered the amendment mentioned above. The two  
4       pending claims read as included in the appendix.

5

6           **V. SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER.**

7

8       The present invention relates to a novel surface mount window for  
9       doors, such as overhead garage doors. The invention allows a user to  
10      readily mount a window to a panel door that can withstand substantial  
11      wind loads. In figure 2 a garage door panel P with an opening shows how  
12      the transparent panel partially passes through with peripheral flange 22  
13      staying on one side of the panel P in contact with the latter with underside  
14      24.

15

16       The means for mounting the transparent panels is disclosed in page 4  
17      of the specifications including fastener members 80 that coact with frame  
18      assemblies 40 and 60, as best seen in figure 2.

19

20

21

1           **VI. GROUNDS FOR REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED**  
2           **ON APPEAL**

4           Whether the claims are anticipated by U.S. patent No. 5,950,398

6           **VII. ARGUMENTS.**

8           References relied by the Examiner:

<u>Patentee</u>	<u>Patent No.</u>	<u>Publication Date</u>
Hubbard	5,950,398	September 14, 1999

13           The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) as  
14   being anticipated by Hubbard. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

16           **1. The cited reference fails to anticipate the claimed invention.**

18           The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), as  
19   being anticipated by U.S. patent No. 5,950,398 to Hubbard. Applicant  
20   respectfully disagrees. Hubbard shows inner pane or interior glazing 18  
21   that the Examiner has equated to Applicant's internal surface. Inner pane

1 18, however, does not pass through the opening of sash 10. Rather, pane 18  
2 is kept "within" the sash, on rabbet 12 abutting against "inner" face 14.

3

4 Also, the claimed invention includes peripheral flange members that  
5 come in abutting contact against the peripheral external surface adjacent to  
6 opening. Hubbard's external surface 17 is also received within the  
7 opening, which is contrary to what is claimed herein. In sum, Hubbard  
8 teaches away from this invention.

9

10 The Examiner states: "If one considers the opening to be defined as  
11 the space between reveal 16 and face 14..." p.2 of Advisory Action Before  
12 the Filing of an Appeal Brief. This assumption fails to take into  
13 consideration the explicit disclosure of the outer surface 13 of Hubbard's  
14 double glazed pass-by window unit 11. The real opening of the sash is  
15 defined by its outer surface 13. The rabbet 12 is interiorly defined and it is  
16 inside the opening. Therefore, the Examiner's assumption is improper.

17

18 In claim 1 the peripheral flange comes in contact with the external  
19 surface. For Hubbard to anticipate Applicant's claimed invention, the  
20 outside panel 17 needs to have a peripheral flange that comes in abutting  
21 contact with outer surface 13 and this is not disclosed in Hubbard.

1 Hubbard uses two panes 17 and 18. Applicant only utilizes one.  
2 Even if we were to combine pane 18 with pane 17, the combination does  
3 not pass through the opening of a garage door panel opening. Panel 18 is  
4 shown in figures No. 3 to be inside the sash.

5

6 The Examiner's assumption is not inherent in the type of product  
7 described in Hubbard. Rabbets are used for recessing the panels in a sash.  
8 This is not intended in the present invention. In this regard, the CCPA has  
9 stated that "[I]nherency, however, may not be established by probabilities  
10 or possibilities: The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given  
11 set of circumstances is not sufficient." *In re Oerlich*, 666 F.2d 578, 581, 212  
12 U.S.P.Q. 323, 326 (CCPA 1981). Therefore, the Examiner's analogy is not  
13 saved by the limited application of inherency principle to overcome the  
14 burden of establishing anticipation.

15

16 There is no evidence in the record that one with ordinary skill will  
17 equate the internal opening defined by a rabbet or reveal 14 with the true  
18 opening of a sash. Nor that causing a panel to come in abutting  
19 relationship with reveal 14 puts the claimed invention in the hand of one  
20 skilled in the art. *In re Donohue*, 766 F.2d 531, 533, 226 U.S.P.Q. 619, 621  
21 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

1           **VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX**

2

3           1. A window assembly for garage doors, comprising:

4

5           A) a transparent panel having an external surface and an internal  
6         surface, said external surface including a peripheral flange member making  
7         said external surface larger than said internal surface with respective  
8         external and internal peripheral edges, and said peripheral flange member  
9         further including a peripheral underside surface that comes in abutting  
10       contact against the peripheral external surface adjacent to an opening in a  
11       garage panel with cooperative dimensions to permit said internal surface to  
12       go through; and

13

14           B) means for mounting said transparent panel on said garage  
15         panel.

16

17           4. The window assembly set forth in claim 1 wherein said means  
18         for mounting said transparent panel on said garage panel includes:

19

20           C) an external frame assembly mounted on said garage panel  
21         around said external peripheral edge.

1           **IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX.**

2           No evidence was adduced in this application.

1           **X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX**

2           There are no related proceedings.

## XI. CONCLUSION.

When this invention and the application's claims are fully analyzed and interpreted as explained above, it will be apparent that there is a good clear difference between this invention and the cited prior art. When all factors are taken into consideration and given their due weight, it is believed that the Board of Appeals will be able to reverse the Examiner and this is now requested.

Kindly charge or credit our Deposit Account No: **19-0129** for the  
rent fees to cover the appeal brief fee.

Respectfully submitted,

**SANCHELIMA & ASSOC., P.A.**  
Attorneys for Applicant  
235 S.W. Le Jeune Road  
Miami, Florida 33134-1762  
Tel.: 305-447-1617  
Fax: 305-445-8484

By:

  
Jesus Sanchelima, Esq.  
Reg. No. 28,755